

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

2000 AUG -6 P 4:29

CLEAN'S OFFICE  
AT BALMORRE

REGENT

2012-12-19

### g. Source: Authority

County Board Can Be Moved In And Of The Court  
Exercise Its Jurisdiction." An Appeal To The County  
Jurisdiction. Confirmed In Federal District Court Is  
An Appeal To The State Discretion Which Guarantees  
The Determination Of The Courts In County . . . .  
Necessity. Hence Then Residency Was Determined  
In The Jurisdiction Of County And Practically Was  
Once County The Instrument For Once Adjustment  
And Reconciliation Between The Public Interest And  
Private Need. . . . Hecht v. Bowles, 321 U.S. 321, 329  
(1944) Such Board Can Be Moved In Any Case In  
Which The Court's Jurisdiction Is Reasonable And Was  
Not Yet Ever Denied. See United Mine Workers 350  
U.S. 47 (1956).





The Commission's Response Two letter reviewed above  
 should be a Request Under Speedy Trial Act, 2002. Should  
 easily be held to meet this standard, particularly  
 given the Commission's stated reasons for responsive  
 treatment of the Defendant (To Amalgamate Docket  
 Henry Richardson and Unsubstantiated Defendant and  
 to Better Serve § 352.2(a) Factors), its relatively  
 unimportant reason for denying retroactivity  
 (Administrative Cost), and the Statutory and  
 Constitutional implications of failure to meet Levy, 396  
 U.S. at 1005 (Douglas, J.) (Granting Bail Pending Review  
 in the Merits of Habeas Petition where Substantial  
 Issues were presented and Defendant's Sentence was  
 due to expire in 12 days); May no, 712 F.2d at 309  
 (May, J. Bail since Defendant did not pose risk of  
 flight or danger to community, and since denial of  
 Bail could leave Defendant without remedy given the  
 minimal time left in his Sentence); Chiles v. Conway,  
 491 F.2d 1324, 1325 (5th Cir. 1974) (District Court "did not  
 remedy abuse of discretion in granting Bail pending  
 habeas hearing where Defendant had raised substantial  
 issues and Attorney Service a Substantial Barrier to  
 his Sentence); Boyer v. City of Orlando, 402 F.2d 966, 968

(37th Cir. 1967) (Dropping Defendant Sir v. A. Scott, 1974  
 State Sentence To 2 1/2 Years In Early Federal Prison  
 In His Habeas Petition In State Court "In Order To  
 Remove [His] State Sentence Thirty Years", And Expresses  
 Release Throughout Federal Habeas Proceedings  
 To State Sentence Rule Hearing Him); Stevens, 127 F. Supp.  
 2d at 672 (Noting That "Extraordinary Circumstances  
 Have Been Found In The Case Of Sir Which In The  
Next-Step Completion Of A Sentence") (Citations: Boyd v.  
Chapman, 2001 WL 314654, \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2001)  
 (Noting That 12 Defendant's Habeas Claims Were Made  
 Substantive, Release In Case Pending Adjudication Since  
 Likely Be Amended Given That He Was Already Served  
 4 years In A 4 1/2 To 7 Year Sentence).

The Defendant's Petition.

\* Boyd was Sentenced To The Law 200 In The Two  
 Defendant's Sentence, 12, 237 Months.

\* The Defendant's Amendment Proves Boyd Sentence -  
 At The Law 200 - To 187 Months.

\* In The Court Record Kingdom And State This Court  
 That Very Downside To The Defendant's Sentence.









Carl L Brown # 32259-037

 $\chi^2_{\text{red}} = 0.27$

*USP Marion  
E-CODE Department*

# *Certificate of Completion*

awarded to:

CARL BROWN

FOR COMPLETION OF  
PRE-RELEASE GROUP



**E-CODE**

A Pyramid of Knowledge and Awareness

FEBRUARY 2005

S. WILSON

E-CODE TREATMENT SPECIALIST

*M. Patterson*  
DR. M. PATTERSON  
E-CODE PROGRAM  
COORDINATOR

# *Certificate of Completion*

## **E-CODE Program**

*This certifies that*

**Carl Brown**

**Reg. No. 32259-037**

*has successfully completed the requirements for the  
Enhanced Challenge, Opportunity, Discipline,  
and Ethics Program.*

**United States Penitentiary**

**Marion, Illinois**

**March 25, 2005**



**E-CODE**

*A Pyramid of Knowledge and Awareness®*

*M. Patterson*

*M. Patterson, Ph. D., Program Coordinator*

*A. Kastner*

*A. Kastner, B.S., E-CODE Treatment Specialist*